DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 476 445 HE 035 864

TITLE	Funding for Widening Participation in Higher Education: Responses to Consultation and Funding for 2003-04 to 2005-06.
INSTITUTION	Higher Education Funding Council for England, Bristol.
REPORT NO	HEFCE-R-2003/14
PUB DATE	2003-03-00
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Higher Education Funding Council for England, Northavon House, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol, BS16 1QD England. Tel: 0117-931-7317; Fax: 0117-931-7203; Web site: www.hefce.ac.uk.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; *Financial Support; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *Resource Allocation; *Student Participation; Summer Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*England

ABSTRACT

This document sets out responses to the 2002 consultation (request for comments) on funding for widening participation in higher education in England. It also sets out the distribution of the 255 million pounds through the widening participation allocation, and describes the new method for allocating this funding that was developed following the consultation responses. From 2003-2004, the allocation method will take into account prior educational attainment and geodemographics. The report also provides further information on the joint Higher Education Funding Council for England/Learning and Skills Council Partnerships for Progression initiative, including confirmation of funding for summer schools and the development of a national program. Annexes contain a summary of consultation responses, weightings for the widening participation allocation, and a breakdown of widening participation funding for 2003-2004. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 476 445

March 2003/14
Core funding/operations
Report on consultation
This report is for information only

This document sets out responses to the consultation on widening participation funding in 2002. It also sets out the distribution of £255 million through the widening participation allocation, and the new method for allocating this funding. It provides further information on the joint HEFCE/LSC Partnerships for Progression initiative, including confirmation of funding for summer schools and the development of a national programme.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Rier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Funding for widening participation in higher education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Responses to consultation and funding for 2003-04 to 2005-06

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE03586

© HEFCE 2003

HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND hefce

Funding for widening participation in higher education

Responses to consultation and funding for 2003-04 to 2005-06

To	Heads of HEFCE-funded higher education institutions Heads of HEFCE-funded further education colleges Heads of universities in Northern Ireland
Of interest to those responsible for	Strategic and corporate planning, Finance, Widening participation, Learning and teaching
Reference	2003/**14**
Publication date	March 2003
Enquiries to	Dr Sheila Watt tel 0117 931 7013 e-mail s.watt@hefce.ac.uk Christine Fraser tel 0117 931 7467 e-mail c.fraser@hefce.ac.uk David Barrett tel 0117 931 7018 e-mail d.barrett@hefce.ac.uk For specific queries about institutional allocations, contact the relevant HEFCE regional consultant or higher education adviser (details available on our web-site, www.hefce.ac.uk under 'About us/People')

Executive summary

Purpose

1. We consulted in 2002 (HEFCE 02/22) on new proposals for widening participation funding for 2003-04 to 2005-06. This document sets out the responses to that consultation and the new methodology for allocating widening participation funding from 2003-04.

Key points

2. Following the responses to the consultation (a summary is included in Annex A), we have revised the method for allocating widening participation funding. From 2003-04 it will take into account prior educational attainment and geodemographics (the weightings are included in Annex B). We will continue to undertake work on available data to ensure we use the most appropriate measures.

3. The amount available for the widening participation allocation has been increased to £255 million in 2003-04. The distribution of the widening participation allocation by institution is set out in Annex C.

4. Higher education institutions will not be required to submit revised widening participation action plans as suggested in HEFCE 02/22. There will be a call for revised widening participation strategies and action plans for 2004-05 to 2006-07, to be published in autumn 2003.

5. Partnerships for Progression will be brought together with Excellence Challenge in 2004 under a programme called 'Aimhigher'. In the interim it will be referred to as Aimhigher: Partnerships for Progression.

6. Funding for summer schools has now been confirmed for a further three years (2003-04 to 2005-06), at £4 million per year.

7. We will work with the Learning and Skills Council to develop a national scheme to work in conjunction with Partnerships for Progression.

Action required

8. No action is required.

Background

9. In April 2002 we consulted the sector on widening participation funding for 2003-06 (HEFCE 02/22). Respondents were asked to comment specifically on:

a. The method of allocating widening participation funding.

b. Whether widening participation funding should be focused on particular institutions.

c. Whether funding should be provided for students who complete part of their studies but not a full year of programme.

d. Whether we should make submission of widening participation strategies and action plans a condition of grant.

10. We received 143 responses from higher education institutions (HEIs), further education colleges (FECs), and other sector bodies and individuals. Of these respondents, 105 were from HEIs (41 'old' universities, 30 'new' universities, 15 general colleges, 19 specialist colleges), 21 were from FECs, and 17 were from other bodies and individuals. The overall response rate to the consultation exercise was very favourable – the responses from HEIs represent approximately 80 per cent of the higher education (HE) sector. This may indicate the strength of feeling in the sector on widening participation issues, and the commitment that many institutions have to the work.

11. In November 2002 we published the principles that had been agreed for widening participation funding for HEFCE-funded institutions for 2003-06 ('Partnerships for Progression – Call for strategic plans to release funding', HEFCE 2002/49, LSC 02/03). We advised that we would publish full information about funding and an analysis of the consultation responses, once the final outcomes of the spending review were announced.

12. The principles agreed were as follows:

a. Outreach activities and student progression are mutually dependent, because raising aspirations, better preparation of students, and good practice in admissions underpin successful retention in higher education. Institutions can therefore use part of their widening participation funding for institutional outreach work that relates to retention. This will apply in particular to institutions that recruit nationally; for work with students not targeted in regional projects for Aimhigher: Partnerships for Progression (previously referred to as Partnerships for Progression or P4P); or for those activities designed to better prepare students for higher education. The focus for outreach work is expected to be Aimhigher: P4P.

b. We provide additional widening participation funding to help institutions support the students that are most at risk of not completing their courses. Previously this funding was allocated through a 'postcode premium' (properly known as the widening participation allocation), based on the number of students recruited from areas where participation in HE is lower than average. We proposed a number of alternatives, including previous entry qualifications, as more reliable measures for identifying students at risk of dropping out. Respondents felt that previous

educational attainment was not an effective enough measure on its own. We have therefore altered the method of determining the widening participation allocation for 2003-04, to take into account previous educational attainment and age of students (to recognise the post-application costs of retention), and a geodemographic element (to recognise pre-application costs of raising aspirations). In 2003-04 the geodemographic element will continue to be allocated using postcode data; we will consult further on measures to be used in subsequent years as better data become available.

c. To allow institutions to continue work that they had planned in their widening participation strategies for 2001-02 to 2003-04, no institution will receive a smaller widening participation allocation in 2003-04 under the new funding methodology than it did through the previous system.

d. Respondents were strongly opposed to the idea that widening participation funding should be allocated only to some institutions. We will therefore provide widening participation funding to all institutions, based on the revised allocation method (discussed in 12b above).

e. There was confusion over the proposal to fund students that completed part of their studies but not a full year of programme. In particular, respondents were unclear whether there would be additional funds or whether money would be taken from existing resources. We will consult further on funding such students, providing further information about the alternatives and costs involved.

f. Respondents supported the proposal that the submission of widening participation strategies and action plans should become a condition of grant for higher education institutions. This was agreed by the HEFCE Board in November 2002.

Further details of responses to the consultation are at Annex A.

13. This document sets out in greater detail the information on the widening participation funding allocation included in institutions' grant letters, updates the HE sector on our widening participation strategy and provides an analysis of the consultation responses.

Coherent approach to widening participation

14. The recently published White Paper 'The future of higher education' re-confirms the Government's commitment to widening and increasing participation in HE. Also, we published our strategic plan for 2003-08 in March 2003 (HEFCE 2003/12). Widening participation and fair access is one of our four core strategic aims. We aim to provide the opportunity of higher education to all those who could benefit from it, and see widening access and increasing participation in higher education as a crucial part of our mission. This document is the first step towards implementing our strategy.

15. A number of initiatives exist to fund widening participation activity in the higher education sector. To avoid the administrative burden to institutions of applying for funding under several initiatives with the same basic aim, we have rationalised these.

Aimhigher: Partnerships for Progression and Excellence Challenge

16. The Government's White Paper indicated that the Excellence Challenge programme (which has funded collaboration between HEIs and schools and colleges in disadvantaged areas) and the joint HEFCE/Learning and Skills Council (LSC) P4P initiative, would be brought together under a programme called 'Aimhigher'. This would provide a coherent national outreach programme, operating most intensively in the most disadvantaged areas.

17. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES), the LSC and HEFCE will be working together over the next year to bring these two initiatives together; further details will be provided in due course.

Aimhigher: Partnerships for Progression

18. The Aimhigher: Partnerships for Progression (Aimhigher: P4P) initiative is a vital part of our joint campaign with the LSC to work with others to raise aspirations and attainment, and to stimulate demand for HE. From April 2003, Aimhigher: P4P will become our principal focus for 'outreach' activity to raise the aspirations and attainments of young people to enter higher education (HEFCE 01/73, HEFCE 2002/49). This initiative will subsume most of our outreach work, including the existing widening participation regional projects and other special initiatives, such as HE summer schools and Excellence Fellowships.
However, we recognise that there is overlap between outreach and student progression, and so widening participation funding will also be available for institutional outreach work (particularly for those institutions that recruit nationally; for work with students not targeted in regional Aimhigher: P4P projects; or for activities designed to prepare students better for the HE experience).

Funding outcomes

Widening participation allocation

19. In January we announced that we are substantially increasing the widening participation allocation from 2003-04 (HEFCE EP 03/2003, 'DfES funding announcement 2003-04 to 2005-06').

20. We have revised our method of allocating widening participation funding. From 2003-04 we will use a combination of geodemographics (postcode in 2003-04) and prior educational attainment (details in Annex B; table showing distribution to institutions at Annex C). This methodology reflects the costs associated with the two main aspects of the student life-cycle: pre-application costs (the costs of aspiration raising) and post-application costs (the costs and risks that institutions are incurring by recruiting students that are more likely to drop out). This allows the widening participation allocation to be used for both raising aspiration and supporting student success.

21. The post-application element uses prior educational attainment, and includes weights based on the risk of non-completion according to a student's preparedness for HE (see Annex B). If the risk of non-completion is to be successfully managed, less well prepared students will require greater investment and support. Since we only count for funding purposes students who complete their year of study, we believe the allocation of a post-application element of funding will provide an additional incentive to build on previous improvements in retention. We believe that the method proposed more accurately reflects these costs, as well as building on institutional strengths.

22. We see this model as a starting point, rather than a final version. Each element will work on the basis of improved delivery generating additional funds, and will develop over time to use the best information as it becomes available. For example, in 2003 we will continue our work to extract data on the school attended at age 16 (subject to UCAS data being available), and on the best ways such schools should be characterised. The overall approach of the model would be consistent over time, but as new indicators become available they will be assessed and incorporated into the model, with a degree of smoothing to ensure that any changes are manageable. We will also carry out more sophisticated modelling in summer 2003 which will consider and quantify the factors affecting non-completion. This may serve as evidence that further elaboration of the current model is required.

23. The allocations are determined on the basis of students who complete their year of study. This will encourage institutions to retain students who are less well prepared for HE, as the new model provides no incentive for institutions to recruit students who do not complete their year of study.

24. We will allocate the total amount of funding available for widening participation as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 **Widening participation allocations in 2003-04**

Funding element	**2003-04**
Pre-application (postcode)	£38M*
Post-application (prior educational attainment)**	£150M
Data contingency (to be allocated in July 2003)	£5M
Additional costs for supporting part-time students	£62M
Total	**£255M**

* £36M for full-time, £2M for part-time; these figures will depend on the data

** This will include young and mature entrants

Funding for part-time students

25. We have allocated the sum of £255 million to widening participation in 2003-04. This includes £62 million used to support the additional costs of part-time students. The 2002 consultation on widening participation funding did not suggest reform of the part-time element, as the existing method was felt to be adequate for allocating the associated amount

of funding. However, given the substantial uplift to the widening participation allocation, there is now a need to reconsider how we allocate funding for part-time students. Work is in hand to more fully understand the costs of part-time education. When that is complete, we will revisit the distribution of part-time funds. However, for this year we will have allocated part-time widening participation funding largely as in previous years: £34 million is pro rata to standard resource for part-time students, and £27 million is the funding associated with the 5 per cent part-time premium. The balance of £1 million is a supplement in respect of additional funded part-time undergraduate places for 2003-04. We plan to consult in 2003 on this issue, and to fully integrate it into the widening participation allocation in 2004-05.

Data contingency

26. Although we believe the data set for pre-entry qualifications is robust, institutions may wish to review their data more thoroughly, because this is the first year that more significant sums of money will be distributed using it. All data are subject to sample audit checks, but since there is a risk that some changes will be necessary we have retained £5 million to deal with any subsequent changes.

Revised widening participation strategies and action plans 2004-05 to 2006-07

27. We proposed in the consultation on widening participation funding that we would call for revised widening participation action plans in 2003 so that institutions would be able to account for changes to their allocations following changes to the methodology. However, after the consultation we made the commitment that no institution would receive less widening participation funding in 2003-04 than it did in 2002-03, and therefore we would not expect institutions to reduce their activities or targets. It would also present a considerable burden for institutions to revise their action plans in 2003 when we will be calling for revised widening participation strategies and action plans in 2004. Therefore we will ask institutions to account for any additional activities planned following increases to their widening participation allocation, through their annual operating statements. The call for annual operating statements will be issued in April. We will then issue a call for revised widening participation strategies and action plans in autumn 2003, for submission in July 2004.

Aimhigher: P4P funding

28. We and the LSC have agreed to provide a minimum of £10 million each year for three years for Aimhigher: P4P. In our grant letter for 2003-04 there was additional funding set aside for Aimhigher: P4P, which is conditional upon links between Aimhigher: P4P and Excellence Challenge being developed under the Aimhigher brand. The grant letter also confirmed a continuation of funding for summer schools – £4 million per year for three years – and the availability of funds that were originally provided for aspiration funding for further widening participation work. Both will be rolled in with Aimhigher: P4P in subsequent years.

Higher education summer schools

29. We indicated in HEFCE 2002/49 (LSC 02/23) that HE summer schools would be funded within Aimhigher: P4P from 2004 onwards. We have provided funding for regional co-ordinators to assist in development of summer schools and to put in place administrative systems, and will expect them to take over running the scheme fully from 2004. Funding for this work has now been confirmed, as set out in paragraph 28; this will allow the current level of activity to be maintained.

30. We also plan to develop a small national summer schools scheme to enable young people to apply for specialist summer schools provision, as part of a national scheme of work for Aimhigher: P4P. Further information is in paragraph 34.

31. Last year we sought views on whether to apply for European Social Fund (ESF) funding for 2003 to 2006, on behalf of the English higher education sector (HEFCE 2002/50). A large proportion of consultation responses expressed interest in using ESF funding to match HE summer schools activity. Subject to Treasury approval, we therefore propose to invite expressions of interest in ESF funding from Aimhigher: P4P partnerships to match ESF funding against regional summer school activity (in summers 2004, 2005 and 2006). We expect to publish more information and a full analysis of the consultation responses by the end of April 2003. Any queries about ESF should be referred to Fiona Reid (f.reid@hefce.ac.uk).

Aspiration funding

32. In 2001 we allocated £6 million per year for three years to help fund aspiration-raising work in institutions where recruitment from state schools was less than 80 per cent. This funding will cease after 2003-04, by which time the institutions that have benefited from the funding will have matched it and embedded the activity.

33. We will add £6 million to the Aimhigher: P4P initiative from 2004-05, to help fund additional outreach work.

National development work

34. We are adding funds for national Aimhigher: P4P activity because a range of activities cut across the regions, and do not fit smoothly into the Aimhigher: P4P regional partnerships. In particular, we will develop a national scheme to enable young people to apply for specialist summer schools provision that is only available outside their region. We also expect that good work in regional partnerships will have the potential to be rolled out nationally. There is a range of other opportunities, including working more closely with other groups (for example, Regional Development Agencies), and extending our summer schools programme to make links with industry. This development funding will also allow us to undertake further work on the added value of other proposed national schemes.

35. We will provide further information to the Aimhigher: P4P regional partnerships once we have agreed their strategic plans, and following discussion with the LSC and the

Aimhigher: P4P National Steering Group about how best to deploy these funds. We are aware that partnerships may find the sudden additional allocation of funds difficult to manage within a short timescale, and will work with them to ensure the best way to allocate funds. In particular we will need to consider the closer integration of Aimhigher: P4P and Excellence Challenge prior to them coming under the joint branding of Aimhigher. We therefore believe that the best approach to the deployment of these funds is to review the existing regional Aimhigher: P4P plans and then prioritise the development and extension of links between Excellence Challenge and Aimhigher: P4P.

36. We will keep under review whether to apply for ESF to match work funded under the national Aimhigher: P4P scheme.

Annex A

Summary of responses to the consultation

1. Institutions were invited to respond to the four issues summarised in paragraph 56 of 'Funding for widening participation in higher education' (HEFCE 02/22). This annex analyses the general comments that were made on widening participation funding, followed by comments received on the four specific issues.

2. A total of 143 responses were received:

- 105 from higher education institutions (percentage response rates are approximate)
  - 41 old universities – 95 per cent response rate
  - 30 new universities – 86 per cent response rate
  - 15 general colleges – 88 per cent response rate
  - 19 specialist institutions – 58 per cent response rate
- 21 from further education institutions
- 12 from HE-related organisations – Council for Industry and Higher Education, Engineering Professors' Council, Greater Manchester Consortium for HE in FE, LTSN Maths, Stats & OR Network, NATFHE (the university and college lecturers' union), NUS, Russell Group, Standing Conference of Principals, Universities Association for Continuing Education, Universities UK, Widening Participation South West, and York Higher Education Collaboration Project and York Progression Partnership
- 5 from other organisations – Fair Enough Project, LG01 Ltd, Headmasters' and Headmistresses' Conference and the Girls' Schools Association, Arts and the Learning City, and Skill: the National Bureau for Students with Disabilities.

This represents an overall HE response rate of 80 per cent.

General comments

3. Many institutions expressed support for our general policy move towards rationalisation of the various strands of funding for widening participation. Many institutions were also pleased that aspiration funding was to end, as it was seen as inequitable. However, some respondents were concerned that institutions may lose funding for some of their outreach work as a result of the separation of retention (postcode premium funding) and outreach (Aimhigher: P4P funding) work. Of particular concern to HEIs was outreach work that may not be encompassed by Aimhigher: P4P such as national (rather than regional) recruitment, and individual links between HEIs and schools or colleges. HEIs were concerned that it is not always possible to separate outreach and retention work, and that by having two funding strands important work may be lost. Some institutions commented that widening participation initiatives could have benefits across the whole student cohort and did not just capture disadvantaged students.

4. Some institutions identified a potential conflict between on the one hand expecting institutions to collaborate in negotiating targets for the Aimhigher: P4P region, and on the other hand setting individual targets for each HEI. Concern was also expressed by a few institutions that the consultation did not go far enough to include part-time or lifelong learning, but concentrated too much on the typical young full-time student. Some institutions were concerned that disability and ethnicity were not properly addressed. There were also comments that setting targets and linking strategies and action plans to grant would encourage chasing of short-term targets at the expense of long-term widening participation aims. One institution suggested that capital investment was needed to improve facilities in order to improve recruitment and retention. Some respondents argued that widening participation did need an incentive.

5. Part-time and mature students continue to be funded in the new widening participation allocation and are an important part of our widening participation policy, as are ethnic minorities and students with disabilities. We are working on refining the funding method for part-time students. We are considering options on how to revise our capital allocations in order to take account of widening participation costs.

Responses to specific issues

a. Should we alter the method of distributing the widening participation funding currently allocated by reference to postcode, to reflect the previous educational achievement and age of students? Or, should we adopt a method of distributing the widening participation funding that takes into account both previous educational achievement and geodemographics?

6. The majority of respondents (76 per cent of all categories; 75 per cent of HEIs: 63 per cent of old universities; 73 per cent of new universities; 89 per cent of specialist institutions; and 93 per cent of general colleges) wished to alter the method of distributing the widening participation allocation funding (postcode premium) and supported one of the methods suggested by us in the consultation (either previous educational achievement and age of students, or previous educational experience and geodemographics). Of these, there was most support (54 per cent of all categories; 57 per cent of HEIs; 77 per cent of old universities; 59 per cent of new universities; 41 per cent of specialist institutions; and 36 per cent of general colleges) for the method combining previous educational experience and geodemographics. Many institutions thought there was a strong link between previous educational achievement and social disadvantage and a subsequent link between previous educational achievement and risk of dropping out.

7. There was limited support for keeping the postcode premium funding method (11 per cent of all categories and 11 per cent of HEIs; this represents 22 per cent of old universities; 10 per cent of new universities; 0 per cent of general colleges and 0 per cent of specialist institutions, that responded). Among this support there was recognition that the postcode method was inaccurate, and that further work would need to be done to improve it. We have assumed that the group that wish to keep the postcode premium would prefer the hybrid

option to previous educational achievement and age, and this would support the case for taking the hybrid funding method forward.

8. Some institutions suggested methods of distributing funding through alternative proxies for disadvantage. Of those who commented, the most popular suggestion was to use a financial indicator, such as the number of students who had part or all of their fees paid following the LEA means-test (this may not be suitable for capturing part-time students who decide not to take the LEA means-test for student loans). This was seen to be the most accurate indication of social disadvantage. Another suggestion was to use a school indicator (for example, the GCSE performance indicators published by the DfES). We have previously looked at using data from the HESA record (which indicated whether students made some contribution to their tuition fee), but this data was not fit for this purpose. We will continue to investigate alternative sources of financial data. We are currently in discussion with UCAS regarding information on schools.

9. A large number of institutions expressed general dissatisfaction with the postcode premium and considered it a blunt instrument. Many institutions stated that it was particularly inaccurate in rural areas and in London, where the social mix across postcode areas was more diverse. The postcode premium was not considered by many to be an accurate proxy for social disadvantage. For example, one institution commented that it had had large numbers of students from socio-economic groups IIIM, IV and V, for whom it received no postcode premium funding. Many in this group thought that there was a less accurate relationship between postcode and drop-out, than between previous educational achievement and age and drop-out.

10. However, the majority of institutions that supported a move away from funding solely by reference to postcode, did wish to keep a geodemographic element in the funding method. Previous educational achievement and age alone were not considered to be a suitable proxy for social disadvantage, and some sort of neighbourhood indicator of disadvantage was considered necessary. Some institutions also suggested that to change the whole funding method at once might result in too great a change in the amount of funding given to each institution in the transitional year, and that this might result in the disruption of institutions' ability to provide services related to widening participation funding.

11. There were some opponents to using previous educational achievement as part of the funding method. A number of institutions were concerned that previous educational achievement was no more accurate a proxy for social disadvantage than postcode, as it would encompass all middle-class under-achievers and not over-achievers from disadvantaged backgrounds or schools. Also, if previous educational achievement resulted in institutions receiving extra funding for students from non-widening participation backgrounds who were under-achievers, this would result in the wrong type of students attracting funds. Although it is open to question whether these students need less support to complete their studies than disadvantaged students with the same grades.

12. Some HEIs argued that to distribute funding according to previous educational achievement would reward those institutions who recruited the most academically unsuitable

students, and that this is not in the sector's interests. Some institutions thought it inappropriate to change from one imperfect funding method to another, and that the postcode premium had the benefit that people were familiar with it and knew roughly what level of income to expect from it.

13. The prior educational attainment and age elements of the widening participation allocation are designed to recognise the actual costs of retaining students who are less well prepared for HE, and therefore reduce the disincentive to recruit such students. Funds are only available to HEIs if students complete the year and so the funding method is not intended to incentivise the recruitment of students who are unlikely to complete at least a year of study. Institutions have to decide who has the ability to benefit from their programmes, and what level of support they need in order to do this.

14. A few HEIs recognised the potential extra data burden that previous educational achievement would place on institutions and the fact that the amount and nature of the detail (qualifications type/grade and so on) used in this funding method might depend on the practicalities of the data return. Many institutions were supportive of using that previous educational achievement within the funding method but were aware of the complexity of entry qualifications. There was a consensus that careful modelling would be needed to determine which qualifications, and at what level, funding should be based on. Some favoured non-A-level qualifications, others low A-level grades and all non-A-level qualifications; others were keen to make sure that A-levels were not left out of the equation (see Annex B).

15. Some institutions were concerned that the consultation had not made clear what was meant by age in relation to the funding method. Some institutions were confused by what we meant by age, and thought that students over 30 would not attract funding. This will not be the case; all students over 21 will attract funding. Many institutions recognised age as a key indicator of increased support costs, although a few institutions considered age of student to be no indicator of increased cost of support.

16. Many institutions stated that the funding method should be transparent so that institutions are able to identify those areas, or schools and colleges, where participation is low so that they can appropriately target their resources. We have developed the POLAR system which is available to institutions, which graphically shows low participation areas so that they might be targeted by outreach activity.

b. Should additional funding be provided only to those institutions with the highest proportion of students most at risk of dropping out?

17. The majority of respondents (82 per cent of all categories, 84 per cent of HEIs; 95 per cent of old universities; 87 per cent of general colleges; 74 per cent of specialist institutions; and 60 per cent of new universities) were against providing additional funding only to those institutions with the highest proportion of students at risk of dropping out. Most institutions considered it necessary to provide all HEIs with some widening participation money and agreed that there was a basic cost involved in running support services aimed at improving

retention, regardless of the proportion of students at risk within the institution. Most institutions who commented supported the view that the funding should follow those students most at-risk, and therefore all HEIs who had students which met the at risk criteria (that is, the widening participation funding criteria) should receive widening participation money.

18. There was a dominant view within the sector that to grant money to only a few institutions would disincentivise those institutions not receiving funds from taking part in widening participation activities. Some institutions voiced concern that, if there was funding for only the top quartiles, institutions might chase at-risk students in order to achieve that funding. There was also concern about the difficulties of planning for institutions that might be at or near the cut-off point between those who received funding and those who did not. Some HEIs expressed the view that there was a risk of polarisation of the sector between widening participation funded and research-led institutions. This would potentially result in widening participation institutions where certain students were channelled, or accepted, with a potentially cumulative effect.

19. A few HEIs suggested that there might be a minimum level of widening participation funding per institution. Some respondents suggested that the widening participation money should be weighted by quartile.

20. Some HEIs did want the funds to be distributed only to the top half or quarter, as they saw the costs for these institutions as being far greater than for institutions who did not have a large at-risk element in their student cohort.

c. Should we provide funding for students who complete part of their studies, but not a full year of programme? (This would need to be based on additional data returns from HEIs showing the modules completed by students.)

21. A large majority of HEIs (71 per cent of all categories; 70 per cent of HEIs; 87 per cent of new universities; 87 per cent of general colleges; 68 per cent of specialist institutions; 46 per cent of old universities) responded positively, in principle, to providing funding for students who complete part of their studies, but not a full year of programme. Many institutions considered it important to recognise the numbers of students who now follow irregular patterns of study and the resulting burden of cost on the HEI. Some respondents also commented that institutions were right to take a justifiable risk on the success of such students. However, many HEIs recognised the extra data burden that would be required of the institutions, and so agreement in principle was often mitigated by the need for any method of funding to be practical and cost-effective. Some respondents suggested that only a very few institutions who already had reporting mechanisms in place would benefit, and therefore whether to claim additional funding for part-completions should be at the discretion of the individual HEI.

22. Only a minority of respondents recognised that, as the funding of part-completions would be delivered through the existing core grant, it would in effect be a redistribution of funds and might reduce the size of the unit of resource.

23. Many institutions were concerned that there was a risk that by funding part-completions, we would potentially be rewarding institutions for failure (in other words, not succeeding in retaining students) and discourage institutions from taking steps to improve retention and student support. There was concern that this could lead to irresponsible admissions practices: institutions could be tempted to admit unsuitable or unprepared students, without due consideration to their ability to complete, in the knowledge that they would receive funding for them.

24. The concept and use of modules varies widely across the sector, and there was disagreement about the ideal method of measuring part-completions. Suggestions for measurement included: completed semesters, enrolled at census dates, completion of modules or credits (although opinion differed on what would constitute 'completion' of a module). A number of respondents suggested that further work and research was necessary to look at the detail of any such funding method and that a degree of consensus would need to be reached as to what measure of part-completion could be used. Institutions referred, both positively and negatively, to the system used to fund module completion in further education.

25. As the responses to funding part-completions raised a lot of issues, we will consult on this again in the teaching funding method review which is expected in autumn 2003.

d. Should we make submission of widening participation strategies and action plans a condition of grant?

26. The majority of respondents (62 per cent of all categories; 60 per cent of HEIs; 80 per cent of general colleges; 68 per cent of specialist institutions; 63 per cent of new universities; 46 per cent of old universities) were in favour of making submission of widening participation strategies and action plans a condition of grant. There was a generally held view that the condition of grant was not dissimilar in practice to the current requirement to submit widening participation strategies and action plans as part of the annual operating statement (AOS). However, there was a polarisation of opinion among HEIs as to the implications of imposing such a condition. The majority of institutions who commented stated that to make it a condition of grant would add weight to the widening participation agenda. Among this group was a common view that, as a condition of grant, it would also act as a disincentive for HEIs to disengage from the widening participation arena (especially for those institutions who may not receive large sums of money from widening participation funding).

27. A significant minority of institutions expressed concern that to make widening participation strategies and action plans a condition of grant was both unnecessary – as they are already included in the AOS – and might change their relationship with us.

28. Widening participation strategies are long term and therefore very different in nature from annual operating statements, which are short term (reporting on the previous year's activity and looking forward one year). It is important that all institutions are engaged with widening participation, and the fact that strategies are now a condition of grant reflects this.

Annex B

Weightings for widening participation allocation

1. Table 2 shows the weightings used for the pre-application costs in 2003-04. Further information on allocation by reference to postcode can be found on our web-site: www.hefce.ac.uk under 'Good practice/Classification of students based on postcode'.

Table 2 **Weightings for widening participation allocation – pre-application costs**

Quartile	Participation rate	Weighting
1	Below 50% of average participation	6
2	50 to 75% of average participation	2
3	75 to 100% of average participation	1
4	Above average participation	0

2. The weightings to determine the funding allocation for the post-application costs make use of non-continuation rates set out in our performance indicators (for further information see HEFCE 2002/52). Table 3 shows the non-continuation rate from first year to second year of entrants to full-time first degree courses in 1999-2000, by the various risk categories.

Table 3 **Non-continuation rate from first year to second year of entrants to full-time first degree courses in 1999-2000, by risk category (post-application costs)**

Risk category		Included entry qualifications	Number of students	Percentage not continuing
Young	Low risk Weight = 0	A-levels or Highers with at least 17 points; degree or higher	103,300	4.1
	Medium risk Weight = 1	A-levels or Highers 10 to 16 points; foundation courses; Baccalaureate	52,500	8.8
	High risk Weight = 1.5	Less than 10 A-level or Highers points; access course; BTEC; GNVQ level 3; HE below degree level; none, others, unknown	63,400	13.5
Mature	Low risk Weight = 0	A-levels or Highers with at least 27 points; degree or higher	3,700	10.3
	Medium risk Weight = 1.5	A-levels or Highers with less than 27 points; HE below degree level; foundation courses; access course	37,800	14.8
	High risk Weight = 2.5	BTEC; GNVQ level 3; Baccalaureate; none, others, unknown	19,000	19.3

List of abbreviations

AOS	Annual operating statement
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
FE	Further education
HE	Higher education
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEI	Higher education institution
LEA	Local education authority
LSC	Learning and Skills Council
LTSN	Learning and Teaching Support Network
P4P	Aimhigher: Partnerships for Progression
UCAS	Universities & Colleges Admissions Service

Annex C

Breakdown of widening participation funding for 2003-04

	Pre-application costs (postcode)		Post-application costs (prior educational attainment)			
INSTITUTION	**Full-time**	**Part-time**	**Full-time**	**Part-time**	**Additional funded part-time undergraduate places**	**Total**
Higher education institutions						
Anglia Polytechnic University	341,913	22,461	2,431,075	1,376,421	21,416	4,193,286
Aston University	248,708	178	356,788	108,579	0	714,253
University of Bath	175,365	0	308,863	107,894	7,949	600,071
Bath Spa University College	128,308	0	928,300	81,355	0	1,137,963
Birkbeck College	0	11,733	522	1,813,640	31,268	1,857,163
University of Birmingham	554,950	0	1,059,299	539,790	5,648	2,159,687
Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies	148,403	30,469	682,062	73,779	0	934,713
Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln	30,167	0	163,070	278	0	193,515
Bolton Institute of Higher Education	236,290	24,500	1,017,323	464,497	9,271	1,751,880
Arts Institute at Bournemouth	39,950	0	313,733	18,094	19,495	391,271
Bournemouth University	226,902	0	1,515,017	313,016	29,888	2,084,823
University of Bradford	292,198	13,489	844,306	192,708	50,730	1,393,432
University of Brighton	278,849	545	1,933,564	443,584	28,105	2,684,646
University of Bristol	205,745	0	262,497	344,634	2,569	815,445
Brunel University	363,801	724	1,448,364	256,458	0	2,069,347
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College	206,972	0	1,468,295	283,795	0	1,959,062
University of Cambridge	248,569	0	332,695	256,604	0	837,868
Institute of Cancer Research	0	0	0	3,105	0	3,105
Canterbury Christ Church University College	141,168	17,894	812,914	610,148	18,488	1,600,612
University of Central England	522,769	39,955	2,156,539	924,863	10,244	3,654,370
University of Central Lancashire	711,524	19,742	3,442,651	986,200	9,900	5,170,016
Central School of Speech and Drama	15,021	0	97,011	4,958	0	116,990

Chester College of Higher Education	251,645	2,251	1,030,218	158,491	9,601	1,452,206
University College Chichester	63,768	0	512,330	176,248	18,138	770,484
City University, London	137,540	568	441,335	262,333	42,169	883,944
Courtauld Institute of Art	1,289	0	6,618	735	0	8,642
Coventry University	567,851	25,125	2,207,159	569,678	14,385	3,384,198
Cranfield University	4,842	0	26,178	140,851	0	171,870
Cumbria Institute of the Arts	57,613	366	295,373	4,992	0	358,344
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	14,956	0	100,614	5,009	0	120,579
Dartington College of Arts	19,063	0	122,846	8,337	2,664	152,910
De Montfort University	643,845	14,129	3,050,264	823,387	0	4,531,624
University of Derby	421,671	19,344	2,115,808	469,372	17,263	3,043,458
University of Durham	309,812	1,746	503,695	183,086	3,885	1,002,224
University of East Anglia	190,915	0	743,275	185,855	0	1,120,045
University of East London	374,791	34,970	2,253,295	711,805	0	3,374,860
Edge Hill College of Higher Education	226,472	11,156	847,774	277,673	21,528	1,384,602
Institute of Education	0	1,426	4,219	236,541	9,100	251,286
University of Essex	219,413	0	897,645	119,750	9,044	1,245,853
University of Exeter	158,184	0	522,087	246,004	8,154	934,429
Falmouth College of Arts	44,772	0	392,556	15,414	2,202	454,944
University of Gloucestershire	204,817	0	1,362,244	324,302	0	1,891,363
Goldsmiths College	120,957	5,664	570,775	248,496	0	945,892
University of Greenwich	491,950	17,512	2,651,608	882,215	5,721	4,049,007
Harper Adams University College	18,770	0	313,700	24,597	23,069	380,135
University of Hertfordshire	506,093	4,181	2,559,038	507,638	0	3,576,949
University of Huddersfield	544,853	31,973	2,035,302	623,117	12,736	3,247,982
University of Hull	388,693	45,547	1,417,309	449,310	0	2,300,859
Imperial College	162,129	0	107,092	188,422	0	457,643
Keele University	180,005	0	494,889	277,622	5,134	957,650
University of Kent at Canterbury	322,641	6,177	1,201,586	444,839	48,946	2,024,189
Kent Institute of Art & Design	93,761	0	491,826	35,096	0	620,683
King Alfred's College, Winchester	117,469	0	579,997	53,809	17,143	768,418
King's College London	312,358	0	549,064	387,257	12,700	1,261,378
Kingston University	461,636	0	2,712,035	504,050	51,227	3,728,948
Lancaster University	284,649	8,142	464,783	262,314	89,254	1,109,143
University of Leeds	641,943	4,488	1,830,312	381,021	0	2,857,764
Leeds Metropolitan University	615,773	22,551	3,930,182	933,245	122,809	5,624,560

University of Leicester	288,337	10,074	514,176	295,870	47,827	1,156,283
University of Lincoln	398,451	17,729	1,982,082	707,866	0	3,106,128
University of Liverpool	561,798	122	1,217,825	350,470	0	2,130,215
Liverpool Hope University College	319,972	26,958	1,020,451	198,501	46,907	1,612,789
Liverpool John Moores University	854,827	34,868	2,839,911	661,847	0	4,391,454
University of London	2,825	0	28,276	19,470	0	50,571
London Business School	0	0	0	59,857	0	59,857
London School of Economics & Political Science	69,249	0	75,581	38,239	0	183,069
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	0	0	0	46,869	0	46,869
The London Institute	279,301	3,837	2,087,666	201,060	5,515	2,577,379
London Metropolitan University	801,845	62,670	4,794,850	1,340,351	0	6,999,716
London South Bank University	281,522	37,015	1,716,382	834,777	0	2,869,697
Loughborough University	351,911	0	691,038	108,313	0	1,151,262
University of Luton	265,444	12,732	1,289,020	496,286	0	2,063,482
University of Manchester	588,766	346	706,835	303,419	20,321	1,619,687
UMIST	192,915	0	242,564	51,183	0	486,661
Manchester Metropolitan University	1,107,794	17,833	4,986,108	844,083	2,391	6,958,210
Middlesex University	576,386	23,022	3,506,795	621,049	0	4,727,252
University of Newcastle	448,299	0	665,818	196,249	5,813	1,316,178
Newman College of Higher Education	64,159	5,937	195,430	48,384	7,979	321,888
University College Northampton	349,494	12,852	1,640,189	290,820	0	2,293,354
Northern School of Contemporary Dance	14,003	0	49,613	0	0	63,616
Northumbria University	746,124	17,545	2,608,748	657,447	40,051	4,069,915
Norwich School of Art & Design	25,805	326	141,941	10,241	0	178,313
University of Nottingham	349,960	0	410,012	386,356	4,722	1,151,049
Nottingham Trent University	693,446	6,167	2,749,875	578,155	0	4,027,643
Open University	0	456,472	0	13,247,344	0	13,703,816
School of Oriental and African Studies	53,312	0	208,942	41,251	0	303,504
University of Oxford	228,608	0	100,204	404,156	0	732,969
Oxford Brookes University	194,818	0	1,479,367	318,296	16,560	2,009,041
School of Pharmacy	27,655	0	23,332	25,987	0	76,974
University of Plymouth	526,231	6,070	3,502,035	825,674	38,338	4,898,348
University of Portsmouth	464,292	13,731	2,465,679	618,798	29,428	3,591,927
Queen Mary, University of London	313,521	0	922,287	211,875	83,307	1,530,990
Ravensbourne College	32,975	0	299,430	3,914	10,402	346,721
RCN Institute	0	162	0	77,723	0	77,885

University of Reading	206,022	0	626,797	225,980	0	1,058,799
Rose Bruford College	28,026	0	100,140	26,314	0	154,480
Royal Academy of Music	5,471	0	25,637	0	0	31,108
Royal Agricultural College	3,863	0	95,390	2,568	0	101,821
Royal College of Art	0	0	0	7,025	0	7,025
Royal College of Music	7,350	0	109,460	4,959	0	121,769
Royal Holloway, University of London	108,359	0	231,113	74,146	0	413,618
Royal Northern College of Music	15,056	0	134,480	2,542	0	152,078
Royal Veterinary College	23,214	219	5,321	19,194	0	47,947
St George's Hospital Medical School	40,592	0	46,607	16,695	17,443	121,336
College of St Mark & St John	56,409	0	362,172	13,340	0	431,921
St Martin's College	74,470	9,972	359,810	375,395	0	819,648
St Mary's College	72,727	0	383,816	24,493	0	481,037
University of Salford	650,955	24,809	2,363,669	671,166	40,199	3,750,797
University of Sheffield	461,794	256	444,547	355,185	0	1,261,782
Sheffield Hallam University	780,238	21,249	3,090,579	722,952	0	4,615,018
University of Southampton	256,218	0	801,719	336,639	27,515	1,422,091
Southampton Institute	320,693	3,074	2,273,920	253,210	0	2,850,897
Staffordshire University	584,645	47,856	2,399,443	761,717	0	3,793,661
University of Sunderland	627,853	60,047	1,698,855	703,647	0	3,090,402
The Surrey Institute of Art & Design Univ College	100,109	0	714,254	21,093	2,292	837,748
University of Surrey	131,573	0	476,936	246,359	0	854,869
University of Surrey Roehampton	175,172	0	1,162,930	155,247	0	1,493,349
University of Sussex	178,964	0	753,010	205,151	0	1,137,125
University of Teesside	486,358	63,840	1,796,777	910,731	34,997	3,292,703
Thames Valley University	182,440	2,681	1,440,389	980,570	15,191	2,621,271
Trinity & All Saints	84,807	129	263,884	13,670	0	362,489
Trinity College of Music	18,016	0	152,292	12,331	1,256	183,895
University College London	253,115	0	587,761	376,860	0	1,217,736
University of Warwick	230,124	125	337,734	430,934	20,994	1,019,912
University of West of England, Bristol	402,624	6,796	3,056,884	723,269	15,324	4,204,898
University of Westminster	448,590	4,188	2,554,503	1,003,920	51,092	4,062,292
Wimbledon School of Art	14,400	0	115,271	18,523	4,108	152,302
University of Wolverhampton	840,844	57,681	3,044,082	983,793	0	4,926,400
University College Worcester	112,492	427	739,040	118,402	7,031	977,391
Writtle College	28,205	0	275,547	34,278	0	338,030

University of York	211,063	0	171,728	64,550	0	447,342
York St John College	132,150	0	570,935	73,399	0	776,483
Further education colleges						
Abingdon and Witney College	0	0	0	12,947	0	12,947
Accrington and Rossendale College	98,624	0	112,575	10,433	0	221,632
Askham Bryan College	5,714	770	55,614	8,414	0	70,512
Barking College	5,845	4,087	28,378	44,157	0	82,466
Barnfield College	48	0	543	13,254	0	13,845
Barnsley College	51,261	7,260	220,482	21,337	0	300,341
Basingstoke College of Technology	9,476	3,653	40,550	19,863	0	73,542
Bedford College	1,811	0	19,844	60,989	0	82,645
Bexley College	0	0	0	9,407	0	9,407
Bishop Burton College	18,020	9,486	143,255	51,176	0	221,938
Blackburn College	43,453	46,094	276,057	181,869	0	547,473
Blackpool and The Fylde College	48,500	0	494,572	71,730	0	614,803
Bolton College	0	0	0	15,079	0	15,079
Boston College	0	0	0	5,926	0	5,926
Bracknell and Wokingham College	0	0	0	13,738	0	13,738
Bradford College	115,548	0	921,224	139,534	0	1,176,306
Bridgwater College	6,637	6,452	48,216	28,689	0	89,994
Bromley College of F & HE	0	470	0	17,058	0	17,528
Brooklands College	0	0	20,156	47,209	0	67,365
Broxtowe College, Nottingham	1,356	0	8,041	0	0	9,397
The Calderdale Colleges Corporation	2,178	3,115	62,935	12,322	0	80,550
Capel Manor College	474	0	17,771	323	0	18,568
Carlisle College	6,057	4,400	28,260	29,192	0	67,909
Carshalton College	4,383	0	31,380	1,060	0	36,824
Chesterfield College	0	0	0	26,816	0	26,816
Chichester College	7,347	178	48,991	17,423	0	73,938
City of Bath College	2,219	0	30,187	23,852	0	56,258
City College, Birmingham	1,709	7,901	29,894	26,912	0	66,416
City College, Coventry	0	0	47,602	35,181	0	82,783
City College, Manchester	27,536	603	163,192	3,675	0	195,006
City of Sunderland College	0	0	17,643	42,674	0	60,317
City of Westminster College	0	0	0	44,943	0	44,943
City of Wolverhampton College	0	1,542	0	10,463	0	12,005

Cleveland College of Art and Design	36,751	246	127,283	12,882	6,391	183,554
Cornwall College	0	1,358	0	35,207	0	36,565
Craven College	2,149	810	29,412	5,725	0	38,096
Crawley College	2,105	977	9,653	29,998	0	42,733
Croydon College	27,660	3,969	194,420	109,141	0	335,190
Dearne Valley College	13,911	4,480	34,447	12,521	0	65,359
Dewsbury College	19,252	2,253	80,916	5,151	0	107,572
Doncaster College	67,725	19,813	329,830	88,528	0	505,895
Dudley College of Technology	9,739	22,702	31,140	62,015	0	125,596
Dunstable College	0	0	0	6,624	0	6,624
Ealing Hammersmith & West London College	3,567	5,545	45,740	14,110	0	68,961
Evesham College	0	0	0	1,362	0	1,362
Exeter College	4,334	0	31,938	20,116	0	56,388
Fareham College	257	1,211	4,219	14,837	0	20,524
Farnborough College of Technology	35,669	0	255,334	62,132	0	353,135
Filton College	5,370	975	37,432	16,474	0	60,252
Gateshead College	9,605	18,743	38,213	48,319	0	114,881
GLOSCAT	6,147	3,338	68,766	44,195	0	122,446
Greenwich Community College	0	0	0	2,691	0	2,691
Grimsby College	33,247	6,402	195,036	46,083	0	280,768
Halesowen College	0	0	0	10,835	0	10,835
Halton College	0	0	18,876	47,929	0	66,805
Harrow College	0	0	0	1,320	0	1,320
Havering College of F & HE	14,917	10,041	89,075	139,985	9,112	263,129
Henley College Coventry	10,303	0	39,152	17,669	0	67,125
Herefordshire College of Art and Design	0	0	65,403	9,410	0	74,812
Herefordshire College of Technology	1,328	709	15,262	26,422	0	43,721
Highbury College, Portsmouth	4,963	7,446	28,340	53,029	0	93,778
Hillcroft College	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hopwood Hall College	15,871	3,225	69,100	21,268	0	109,464
Huddersfield Technical College	1,492	1,861	13,400	8,683	0	25,436
Hull College	15,045	23,489	93,942	98,589	19,023	250,088
Joseph Priestley College	0	0	0	901	0	901
Keighley College	0	0	0	8,545	0	8,545
Kensington and Chelsea College	0	0	0	9,736	0	9,736
Kidderminster College	2,158	0	9,574	0	0	11,732

Kingston College	0	726	0	35,302	0	36,028
Lakes College - West Cumbria	3,299	9,048	19,527	48,740	0	80,614
Lambeth College	0	175	0	5,767	0	5,942
Leeds College of Art and Design	40,982	469	200,426	8,548	0	250,425
Leeds College of Music	23,907	0	134,244	0	0	158,151
Leeds College of Technology	0	5,589	0	27,153	0	32,742
Leicester College	6,416	3,761	37,917	46,574	0	94,669
Lewisham College	0	0	0	30,457	0	30,457
Lincoln College	3,178	7,125	58,568	58,836	0	127,706
Liverpool Community College	32,357	11,294	111,282	43,595	0	198,527
Long Road Sixth Form College	0	0	0	1,524	0	1,524
Loughborough College	15,779	5,253	102,854	20,358	0	144,244
Macclesfield College	0	0	0	11,165	0	11,165
Manchester College of A&T	11,437	17,574	49,492	59,712	0	138,215
Matthew Boulton College of F & HE	0	0	19,944	20,837	0	40,780
Merrist Wood College	0	0	33,237	6,086	0	39,322
Mid-Cheshire College of FE	7,213	2,122	38,232	15,961	0	63,528
New College, Durham	46,837	39,626	210,760	124,142	0	421,365
New College, Nottingham	0	0	0	31,741	0	31,741
New College, Telford	0	0	0	2,023	0	2,023
Newbury College	0	0	0	6,782	0	6,782
Newcastle College	150,066	27,751	576,266	72,141	14,508	840,733
Newham College of Further Education	0	0	52,415	20,520	0	72,936
North East Surrey College of Technology	14,217	0	232,463	134,440	0	381,120
North East Worcestershire College	16,140	0	60,379	42,201	0	118,721
North Lindsey College	0	1,899	0	13,561	0	15,459
North Nottinghamshire College	0	2,457	0	11,227	0	13,684
N Oxfordshire College & School of Art	5,792	0	31,216	13,654	0	50,662
North Trafford College of FE	968	10,011	11,510	41,785	0	64,274
North Tyneside College	0	0	46,146	21,638	0	67,785
North Warwickshire and Hinckley College	0	6,153	0	21,286	0	27,439
North West Kent College of Technology	0	0	0	11,212	0	11,212
The College of North West London	1,424	2,756	21,004	31,283	0	56,466
Northampton College	0	0	0	1,457	0	1,457
Northbrook College, Sussex	29,169	0	327,384	29,748	0	386,300
Northumberland College	1,819	7,145	12,398	23,950	0	45,312

Oldham College	63,037	14,798	161,522	42,884	0	282,241
Otley College of Agriculture & Horticulture	0	0	17,130	7,218	0	24,349
Oxford College of Further Education	1,350	1,261	9,040	18,554	0	30,206
Park Lane College	0	0	0	17,731	0	17,731
The People's College, Nottingham	14,421	4,180	89,301	29,555	0	137,456
Pershore Group of Colleges	0	0	0	20,970	0	20,970
Peterborough Regional College	7,421	3,343	60,771	49,493	0	121,028
Plymouth College of Art and Design	0	330	0	3,825	0	4,155
Plymouth College of Further Education	0	474	0	21,055	0	21,529
Reading College & School of Art & Design	16,125	2,677	154,591	61,444	0	234,837
Richmond Adult and Community College	0	1,169	0	11,301	0	12,470
Richmond upon Thames College	0	585	0	5,842	0	6,427
Ridge Danyers College	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rother Valley College	0	0	0	4,863	0	4,863
Rotherham College of Arts and Technology	0	0	0	27,034	2,588	29,621
Rugby College of Further Education	0	1,476	0	10,591	0	12,067
Runshaw College	5,024	1,540	0	4,567	7,728	18,859
Ruskin College	0	0	0	12,771	0	12,771
Rycotewood College	0	0	39,778	0	0	39,778
Salford College	0	0	0	30,295	0	30,295
Salisbury College	4,503	382	52,495	20,981	0	78,361
Sandwell College	0	0	0	23,194	0	23,194
Selby College	0	0	0	7,901	0	7,901
The Sheffield College	29,343	11,274	24,406	38,857	0	203,880
Shipley College	0	0	0	1,261	0	1,261
The Solihull College	26,498	279	137,258	40,724	0	204,759
Somerset College of Arts and Technology	0	1,621	0	36,308	0	37,929
South Birmingham College	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Cheshire College	1,267	13,609	10,930	49,619	0	75,424
South Downs College	8,294	3,172	29,087	10,901	0	51,454
South Leicestershire College	144	868	1,736	3,161	0	5,909
South Nottingham College	0	0	0	1,284	0	1,284
South Thames College	0	6,514	0	46,157	0	52,671
South Trafford College	5,138	0	21,285	4,200	1,404	32,026
South Tyneside College	0	0	0	43,894	0	43,894
Southampton City College	0	0	0	13,198	0	13,198

Southport College	0	0	6,677	1,907	0	8,584
Sparsholt College, Hampshire	7,794	0	98,376	16,787	0	122,956
St Helens College	40,276	36,580	155,759	115,096	0	347,711
Stephenson College	1,279	4,796	11,735	37,716	0	55,526
Stockport College of FHE	31,922	15,334	172,479	91,697	0	311,432
Stourbridge College	0	0	0	10,308	0	10,308
Stratford upon Avon College	0	0	4,701	0	0	4,701
Strode College	0	0	18,732	3,010	0	21,741
Stroud College of Further Education	0	1,200	0	20,538	0	21,738
Suffolk College	48,241	3,350	388,148	120,305	0	560,045
Sutton Coldfield College	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swindon College	21,450	2,376	104,304	16,305	0	144,436
Tameside College	19,248	13,266	57,625	30,863	0	121,001
Telford College of Arts and Technology	0	0	0	19,833	0	19,833
Thomas Danby College	0	567	0	10,018	0	10,585
Totton College	0	0	964	2,771	0	3,736
Tynemouth College	0	0	0	1,681	0	1,681
Uxbridge College	0	0	0	6,534	0	6,534
Wakefield College	20,201	12,622	66,934	31,595	0	131,352
Walsall College of Arts and Technology	0	19,637	60,184	44,167	0	123,989
Warwickshire College, Royal Leamington	26,606	3,912	178,506	49,902	0	258,925
West Cheshire College	0	0	0	26,584	0	26,584
West Kent College	0	350	0	16,038	0	16,388
West Nottinghamshire College	9,895	8,086	36,085	28,306	0	82,373
West Thames College	7,073	42	46,556	5,354	0	59,025
Westminster Kingsway College	9,652	0	78,010	18,084	0	105,746
Wigan and Leigh College	23,502	3,826	124,653	72,487	0	224,469
Wiltshire College	2,980	4,401	35,128	35,687	0	78,196
Wirral Metropolitan College	13,367	6,528	126,940	55,138	0	201,973
Worcester College of Technology	24,649	2,209	151,088	31,168	0	209,114
Wyke Sixth Form College	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yeovil College	1,676	3,493	9,505	62,548	0	77,222
York College	6,053	0	76,578	28,630	0	111,261
Yorkshire Coast College of F & HE	2,121	1,120	20,256	8,784	0	32,281
Totals	**35,836,863**	**2,118,610**	**150,000,000**	**61,396,694**	**1,449,598**	**250,801,765**

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").